UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,809	05/31/2001	Kazuaki Nakajima	P/289-165	1249

7590	06/15/2005

STEVEN I. WEISBURD, ESQ.
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS- 41ST FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER
BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/870,809	NAKAJIMA, KAZUAKI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Djenane M. Bayard	2141	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 November 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,3,4,6,7,9-11,13 and 14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,3,4,6,7,9-11,13 and 14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1,4, 7, 10-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0037266 to Schroeder in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,697844 to Chan et al.

a.   As per claims 1 and 4, Schroeder teaches a method of identifying a server from a client

terminal having a browser and a processor, said server and said client terminal being connectable

with each other via a communications network, comprising the steps of: a) transmitting a first

request packet from said browser to said server (; b) receiving the first request packet at said

server and transmitting therefrom server specific information to said browser, indicating a server

in which shared data file is maintained; c) receiving said server specific information at said

browser and invoking said processor to hand over the received information to the processor; d)

transmitting a second request packet from the processor to a server specified by the received

server specific information; and e) receiving the second request packet at the specified server and

transmitting therefrom said shared data file to said processor (See page 3 paragraph 0037]).

However, Schroeder fails to teach f) transmitting a third request packet from said processor to

the specified server and transmitting therefrom differential data representing a difference

between the shared data file maintained by the server and the shared data file stored in said

memory device.

Chan et al teaches an Internet browsing using cache based compaction. Furthermore,

Chan et al teaches transmitting a third request packet from said processor to the specified server

and transmitting therefrom differential data representing a difference between the shared data file

maintained by the server and the shared data file stored in said memory device (See col. 4, lines

40-58 and col. 6, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate transmitting a third request packet from said processor to the specified

server and transmitting therefrom differential data representing a difference between the shared

data file maintained by the server and the shared data file stored in said memory device as taught

by Chan et al in the claimed invention of Schroeder in order to transmit only changes between

current and past information (See col. 2, lines 9-15).

b.   As per claims 7 and 11, Schroeder teaches a communications network ; a server

connected to the network; and a client terminal connected to the network, the client terminal

having a processor and a browser, the browser transmitting a first request packet to said server;

said server being responsive to said first request packet for transmitting a server specific

information to said browser for indicating a server in which shared data file is maintained, said

browser being responsive to said server specific information for invoking said processor to hand

over the received information thereto, said processor being responsive to the received

information for transmitting a second request packet to a server specified by the received

information and being configured to store the shared data file from said specified server in said

memory device (See page 3, paragraph [0037]). Remarks : It is inherent that the client terminal

has a processor in order to process the request and the response from the server. However,

Schroeder fails to teach transmit a third request packet to the specified server, and the specified

server being responsive to the second request packet for transmitting said shared data file to said

processor and being configured to transmit differential data representing a difference between

the shared data file maintained by the server and the shared data file stored in said memory

device

Chan et al teaches an internet browsing using cache based compaction. Furthermore,

Chan et al teaches transmitting a third request packet from said processor to the specified server

and transmitting therefrom differential data representing a difference between the shared data file

maintained by the server and the shared data file stored in said memory device (See col. 4, lines

40-58 and col. 6, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate transmitting a third request packet from said processor to the specified

server and transmitting therefrom differential data representing a difference between the shared

data file maintained by the server and the shared data file stored in said memory device as taught

by Chan et al in the claimed invention of Schroeder in order to transmit only changes between

current and past information (See col. 2, lines 9-15).

c.   As per claims 10 and 14, Schroeder in view of Chan et al teaches the claimed invention

as described above. Furthermore, Schroeder teaches wherein said server is configured to receive

server specific information from another server of the network and transmits the received server

specific information to said browser (See page 3, paragraph [0037]).

3.   Claims 3, 6, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent Application No. 2001/0037266 to Schroeder in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697844 to Chan

et al. as applied to claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,717

to Bhide et al.

a.   As per claims 3, 6, 9 and 13, Schroeder teaches the claimed invention as described

above. However, Schroeder fails to teach wherein said network includes a cache memory, and

wherein said second request packet contains an identifier identifying said shared data file, said

identifier being determined for each access from said processor to said server so that the shared

data file identified by said identifier does not coincide with data stored in said cache memory.

Bhide et al teaches wherein said network includes a cache memory, and wherein said

second request packet contains an identifier identifying said shared data file, said identifier being

determined for each access from said processor to said server so that the shared data file

identified by said identifier does not coincide with data stored in said cache memory (See col. 12,

lines 15-35)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein said network includes a cache memory, and wherein said

second request packet contains an identifier identifying said shared data file, said identifier being

determined for each access from said processor to said server so that the shared data file

identified by said identifier does not coincide with data stored in said cache memory as taught by

Bhide et al in the claimed invention of Schroeder in order to set up the cache of information and

realize a performance increase (See col. 8, lines 1-3).

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER